

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

LG.PHILIPS LCD CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS
CORPORATION, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 06-726 (JJF)
Civil Action No. 07-357 (JJF)

CONSOLIDATED CASES

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Plaintiff LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. (“LG.Philips”) and Defendants AU Optronics Corporation (“AUO”), AU Optronics Corporation America (“AUO America”), Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation (“CMO”), and Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc. (“CMO USA”), by and through their respective counsel, hereby submit this joint status report pursuant to this Court’s January 31, 2008 Order (D.I. 152) and state the following:

1. On December 1, 2006, LG.Philips filed a Complaint for Patent Infringement against Defendants CMO, AUO, AUO America, Tatung Company, Tatung Company of America, Inc., and ViewSonic Corporation (“ViewSonic”) alleging infringement of three of LG.Philips’s United States patents (D.I. 1, Case No. 06-726). The case was assigned to Judge Farnan.

2. On March 8, 2007, AUO filed a Complaint for Patent Infringement in the Western District of Wisconsin against LG.Philips and its subsidiary, LG.Philips LCD America, Inc. On May 30, the Honorable John C. Shabaz transferred AUO’s Wisconsin action to this Court for consolidation with the 06-726 case. (D.I. 49, Ex. 1, Case No. 07-357.) On July 3, 2007, Case 06-726 was reassigned to Judge Sleet. On July 19, 2007, Judge Farnan consolidated Case No.

07-357 into Case No. 06-726 before Judge Sleet. (D.I. 100, Case No. 07-357.) However, on December 14, 2007, the consolidated cases were reassigned to Judge Farnan.

3. There are no pending motions filed by AUO. There are no pending motions filed by LG.Philips with respect to AUO's claims. On February 1, 2008, LG.Philips filed a letter with the Court stating that the case against AUO is ready for a scheduling order (D.I. 151).

4. CMO, however, filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficiency of service of process (D.I. 19).¹ LG.Philips filed a motion for sanctions against CMO for filing the jurisdictional challenge (D.I. 86). LG.Philips also moved, in the alternative, for an order directing CMO to permit LG.Philips to use the discovery produced in the matter of *Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.*, Case No. 03-484-MPT (D. Del.), to respond to CMO's jurisdictional challenge or, in the further alternative, to conduct jurisdictional discovery (see D.I. 80). These motions are fully briefed and ready for decision.

5. Prior to the consolidation of the cases, in Case No. 07-357 LG.Philips filed counterclaims against AUO, AUO America, CMO, and CMO USA (Case No. 07-357, D.I. 73). CMO filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficiency of service of process (Case No. 07-357, D.I. 89). This motion is fully briefed and ready for decision.

6. In addition, CMO joined (D.I. 119) ViewSonic's motion to strike (D.I. 114) LG.Philips' Amended Complaints filed April 11, 2007 (D.I. 29) and May 22, 2007 (D.I. 54). This motion is fully briefed and ready for decision.

7. CMO also filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficiency of service of process (D.I. 131) the Additional Counterclaims filed by LG.Philips

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all D.I. references are in Case No. 06-726.

(D.I. 124). CMO USA moved to strike (D.I. 132) the Additional Counterclaims filed by LG.Philips (D.I. 124). These motions are fully briefed and ready for decision.

8. Three defendants have recently settled with LG.Philips: Tatung Company, Tatung Company of America, Inc. and ViewSonic. On December 14, 2007, an amended stipulation of dismissal was filed pursuant to the settlement agreement reached between LG.Philips and Defendants Tatung Company and Tatung Company of America (D.I. 148), and on February 1, 2008 a stipulation of dismissal was filed pursuant to the settlement agreement reached between LG.Philips and Defendant ViewSonic (D.I. 150). These stipulations dismiss all claims between LG.Philips and these three Defendants. As part of the stipulation, ViewSonic also withdrew as moot all pending motions it had filed (*see* D.I. 37, 39, 41, 114 and 122).

9. On February 1, 2008, LG.Philips filed a letter with the Court requesting that the Court set a status conference to establish a schedule for proceeding with this case (D.I. 151).

February 8, 2008

OF COUNSEL:

Gaspare J. Bono
Song K. Jung
R. Tyler Goodwyn, IV
Lora A. Brzezynski
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 496-7500

BAYARD, P.A.

/s/ Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)
Richard D. Kirk
Ashley B. Stitzer
222 Delaware Avenue, 9th Floor
P.O. Box 25130
Wilmington, DE 19899-5130
(302) 655-5000
rkirk@bayardfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd.

OF COUNSEL:

Kenneth R. Adamo
Robert C. Kahrl
Arthur P. Licygiewicz
Jones Day
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-1190
(216) 586-3939

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

/s/ Philip A. Rovner (pr3215)
Philip A. Rovner
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Defendants Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation and Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc.

OF COUNSEL:

Vincent K. Yip
Peter J. Wied
Jay C. Chiu
Hua Chen
Paul Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 683-6000

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

/s/ Karen L. Pascale (kp2903)
Karen L. Pascale
John W. Shaw
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, DE 19899-0391
(302) 571-6600
kpascale@ycst.com

Attorneys for Defendants AU Optronics Corporation and AU Optronics Corporation America

M. Craig Tyler
Brian D. Range
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
8911 Capital of Texas Highway North
Westech 360, Suite 3350
Austin, TX 78759-8497
(512) 338-5400